REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action October 17, 2005 is respectfully requested. Claims 1-28 have been rejected. Claim 29 has been added. As such, claims 1-29 are currently pending.

New claim 29 recites similar limitations as those recited in claim 17. New claim 29 also recites performing remote authentication, and obtaining static information form an editable field. Support for this new claim may be found in the Specification, as for example from page 10 at line 22 to page 11 at line 13.

Specification

The Specification has been amended to correct a minor typographical error. Specifically, reference number "123," which was used in error, has been replaced by reference number "124."

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to include reference signs mentioned in the detailed description. In particular, the Examiner has cited the use of reference number 123 on page 2, line 25 of the Specification. Upon review of the Specification, the Applicant has determined that the use of reference number 123 was in error, and that the occurrence of reference number 123 should have been an occurrence of reference number 124. As such, Fig. 1 is correct as originally filed. The Applicant has amended the Specification to remove the use of reference number 123. The Examiner is sincerely thanked for pointing out this error to the Applicant.

Per the Examiner's request, formal drawings are being submitted with this Amendment. No amendments have been made to any of the drawings.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 17-21, 23, 24, 27, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,452 issued to Nishino. (hereinafter "Nishino"). Claims 6, 13-16, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino as applied to claims their respective base claims and, further, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,493 issued to Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee"). Claims 12, 25, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino as applied to claims their respective base claims and, further, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,635 issued to Stewart et al. (hereinafter "Stewart").

Discussion of Nishino Reference

The Applicant submits that Nishino discloses that a terminal (terminal 100) is a wireless information processing terminal, a wireless mobile station, or a mobile station (Nishino, column 8 at lines 31-32 and column 14 at lines 26-28). At lines 43-46 of column 10, Nishino states:

> "It should be understood that the terminal 100 is provided with both functions of the so-called PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) and PHS (Personal Handyphone System) for wireless communication."

Hence, the **terminal that Nishino refers to is a mobile wireless device, and not an access point**.

For the Examiner's convenience, the Applicant notes that an access point is a wireless transceiver device that is arranged to have wireless communications with roaming devices (see, *e.g.*, page 2 of the Specification). An access point is a fixed (not mobile) device that enables a roaming device to communicate in a wireless manner with a local area network (Specification,

page 2 at lines 8-9). **An access point is not equivalent to the mobile wireless device of Nishino.** In fact, Nishino discloses that a terminal may associate with an access point (Nishino, column 12 at lines 46-53), and that a dialer of a terminal may acquire a telephone number for an access point (Nishino, column 14 at lines 2-5). Hence, it is respectfully submitted that even **Nishino teaches that the terminal in U.S. Patent No. 6,233,452 is not an access point.**

On page 7 of the Office Action dated October 17, 2005, the Examiner appears to acknowledge that Nishino does not disclose that a wireless transceiver device is an access point.

1. Claims 1, 7 and their dependents

Claim 1 recites a wireless transceiver device which interfaces with a roaming device, and includes computer code for causing static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted and stored in an editable field of a memory. The wireless transceiver device also includes computer code for causing a record associated with the roaming device to be generated. The record includes the static input information and is stored on the memory.

Contrary to the Examiner's arguments, it is respectfully submitted that Nishino does not teach the wireless transceiver device of claim 1. There appears to be an inconsistency as to what the Examiner considers to be a "wireless transceiver device." The Examiner appears to believe in some places that the "wireless transceiver device" is an access point, and in other places the Examiner appears to believe that the "wireless transceiver device" is a terminal. As discussed above, an access point is not equivalent to the terminal disclosed by Nishino.

It is noted that claim 1 recites a wireless transceiver device that includes computer code for causing static information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted and stored. That is, the wireless transceiver device accepts and stores information about itself. On page 3 of the Office Action dated October 17, 2005, the Examiner cites step S212 of FIG. 5 of

Nishino, as well as the accompanying description, as teaching of "computer code for causing static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be accepted." Lines 34-36 of column 10 of Nishino read as follows:

> "FIG. 5 shows a flow chart of a second **operational example of the wireless information processing terminal 100**." [emphasis added]

Hence, FIG. 5 shows the operation of a terminal. Step S212 reads "manually input access point," which is disclosed as meaning that a **telephone number of a desired access point is inputted into a communication record table of the terminal** (Nishino, column 15 at lines 5-10). Inputting a telephone number of one device (an access point) into another device (a wireless information processing terminal) is not equivalent to entering information associated with a device into itself, as required in claim 1. As such, Nishino fails to teach a wireless transceiver device that includes computer code for causing static input information associated with itself (the wireless transceiver device) to be accepted and stored. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 1 also requires computer code that causes a record associated with a roaming device that includes the static input information associated with the wireless transceiver device to be generated. The only record that Nishino appears to disclose is a record associated with a terminal (Nishino, column 14 at lines 31-39). Nishino does not teach that such a record has anything to do with a roaming device. At best, the record associated with the terminal may contain a telephone number of a desired access point (Nishino, column 15 at lines 5-10). However, an access point is not a roaming device. A base station, as disclosed at lines 42-54 of column 8 of Nishino, is also not a roaming device. As the Examiner appears to equate the terminal of Nishino to the wireless transceiver device of claim 1, the terminal cannot also be the "roaming device," since the wireless transceiver device is arranged to interface with the roaming device. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Nishino for at least this additional reason.

Claims 2-6 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are each also believed to be allowable over Emery for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 1, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record. By way of example, claim 2 recites that a wireless transceiver device also includes computer code for obtaining data when a roaming device is in communication with the wireless transceiver device. FIG. 5 of Nishino, which is cited by the Examiner in his rejection, shows operational steps of a terminal. The terminal connects to the Internet when the terminal comes into a mobile environment (Nishino, column 14 at lines 31-39). The mobile environment is a cell of a base station (Nishino, column 14 at lines 40-45), and is not a roaming device. Rather, the terminal is the roaming device relative to a mobile environment of a Internet/BBS provider. Nishino does not appear to disclose any roaming device that is in communication with the terminal. As such, the terminal of Nishino does not appear to include computer code for obtaining data when a roaming device is in communication with it.

If the Examiner believes that the terminal of Nishino is a roaming device and that the mobile environment of Nishino is a wireless transceiver device, the Applicant notes that there is no disclosure in Nishino that a mobile environment includes computer code for causing static input information associated with itself to be accepted and stored in an editable field of the mobile environment, or includes computer code for causing a record associated with the terminal to be generated by the mobile environment to include the static input information. Therefore, claim 2 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this additional reason.

Dependent claim 5 recites that static input information is a location associated with a wireless transceiver device. The Examiner has argued that Nishino teaches of such a limitation. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's argument, and notes that there is no teaching in Nishino that a location associated with a wireless transceiver device is accepted by the wireless transceiver device. Instead, Nishino appears to disclose that a telephone number associated with an access point is accepted by a terminal. A terminal that accepts a telephone number associated with an access point cannot be said to be equivalent to a wireless transceiver

device that accepts a location associated with itself. Therefore, claim 5 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for this additional reason as well.

Independent claim 7 recites similar limitations as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Each of claims 8-16, which depend from claim 7, are believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons for which claim 7 is allowable. Each of these dependent claims recites additional limitations, which when considered in light of claim 7, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record.

2. Claim 17 and its dependents

Independent claim 17 recites a method for utilizing a wireless transceiver device that includes similar limitations to those recited in independent claim 1. As such, claim 17 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claims 18-23 each depend from claim 17. Therefore, each of claims 18-23 is also believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

The method of utilizing a transceiver device of claim 17 recites receiving an indication that a roaming device is within the communications range of the transceiver device. While the passage of Nishino cited by the Examiner (from column 8 at line 42 to column 9 at line 2) on page 4 of the Office Action dated October 17, 2005 appears to discuss a mobile station entering a wireless cell and registering itself with the base station of the wireless cell, this passage is not consistent with the Examiner's arguments pertaining to the other limitations of claim 17.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, a (wireless) transceiver device receives and stores static information about itself into a memory. The Examiner has essentially argued that a wireless transceiver device (terminal) stores static information about an access point into the

wireless transceiver device. An access point not a roaming device, and a wireless cell with a base station is also not a roaming device. Hence, Nishino fails to teach that a wireless transceiver device receives an indication that a roaming device is within a communications range, and also does not teach of storing information about a roaming device into memory. If the wireless cell with a base station of Nishino is considered to be a wireless transceiver device, and the terminal of Nishino is considered to be a roaming device, the Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Nishino that a wireless cell with a base station receives and stored static information about itself into an editable field stored in memory. Therefore, claim 17 is believed to be allowable for at least this reason as well.

3. Claim 24 and its dependents

Claim 24 recites a method of configuring an access point which includes positioning the access point at a desired location, determining an address of the desired location at which the access point is positioned, and storing the address of the desired location in a memory field associated with the access point.

It is not clear to the Applicant what device of Nishino the Examiner believes to be an access point. The Examiner argues that step S214 of FIG. 5 of Nishino somehow teaches of storing the address of a desired location of an access point in a memory field associated with the access point. Step S214 of FIG. 5 of Nishino relates to adding a record to a terminal and, as discussed at lines 10-15 of Nishino, the record on the terminal "describes an association between the inputted telephone number of this access point and the current NTT exchange identification umber that is written into the 'communication record table' ... the telephone number of the access point is dialed accordingly." The terminal of Nishino is an information processing terminal, and is provided with function of a PDA and a PHS (Nishino, column 10 at lines 40-46). The terminal of Nishino is not an access point. Storing an address of an access point in a memory field of a terminal is not equivalent to storing an address of an access point in a memory

field associated with the access point. Hence, claim 24 is believed to be allowable over Nishino for at least this reason.

If the Examiner is arguing that the access point mentioned by Nishino in the description of FIG. 5 is equivalent to the access point of claim 24, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner please indicate how he believes Nishino teaches that the access point whose telephone number is stored in a record of a terminal also stored its own address in a memory field.

Further, the Applicant submits that Nishino does not teach determining an address of a desired location at which an access point is positioned. A telephone number associated with an access point is not an address of a location.

Claims 25-28 each depend from claim 24. Therefore, each of these claims is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons indicated above with respect to claim 24. Each of these claims is believed to recite additional limitations which, when considered in light of claim 24, are believed to further distinguish the claimed invention over the art of record. By way of example, claim 27 recites inputting the address of a desired location of an access point into the access point. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Nishino does not teach this limitation. The Examiner has cited step S212 of FIG. 5 of Nishino as teaching of this limitation. Step S212 of FIG. 5 of Nishino, as discussed above, teaches of inputting a telephone number of a desired access point into a terminal. Inputting a telephone number of a desired access point into a terminal is not equivalent to inputting an address of a desired location of an access point into the access point. Nishino does not teach of inputting an address of an access point into the access point. Accordingly, claim 27 is believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least this additional reason.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 868-4096.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy A. Su
Reg. No. 41,336

AKA CHAN LLP
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 710
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel: 408-868-4096
Fax: 408-608-1599